



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/552,138 | 07/10/2006 | Nicolas Prigent | PF030060 | 7177 |
| 24498 7590 04/11/2011 Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations THOMSON Licensing LLC P.O. Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312 | | | EXAMINER RUBIN, BLAKE J | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2457 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 04/11/2011 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/552,138

Applicant(s)

PRIGENT ET AL.

Examiner

BLAKE RUBIN

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-942)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to a communications filed February 22, 2011.
2. Claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by**

Hanson et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0098840, hereinafter Hanson).

5. With respect to claim 1, Hanson discloses a device adapted to belong to a community of networked devices (paragraph [0089], lines 3-14), said device comprising:

a provable identity and/or means for generating and/or obtaining a provable identity (paragraph [0145]);

means adapted to store information about devices of the community

having trust relationships with said device (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6);

means adapted to store information about devices not trusted by said device (paragraph [0096], lines 1-06);

means adapted to store information about devices of the community having had trust relationships with said device in the past but now not trusted by said device (paragraph [0218], lines 10-18);

means for trust relationships synchronization (paragraph [0099], 12-20) with each device belonging to said community of network devices based on the stored information (paragraph [0099], lines 1-12).

6. With respect to claim 3, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 1, wherein the information about devices comprises the provable identity of said devices (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6).

7. With respect to claim 4, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 1, wherein said device is furthermore designed to store information comprising proofs received from other devices of the community that said device is trusted by other devices (paragraph [0104]).

8. With respect to claim 5, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 1, wherein said means for trust relationship synchronization comprise means to exchange information with other devices of the community about devices trusted and/or not trusted by other devices in the community (paragraph [0099], 12-20).

9. With respect to claim 6, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 1, wherein said devices comprises:

a first object capable of containing identities of devices trusted (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6)

a second object capable of containing identities of devices trusted by said device (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6); and

a third object capable of containing identities of devices distrusted by said device (paragraph [0218], lines 10-18).

10. With respect to claim 7, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 6, wherein said device is able to modify the content of said first object and/or said second object and/or said third object as a function of information exchanged with other devices of the community (paragraph [0103], lines 7-17).

11. With respect to claim 8, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 6, wherein said first object and/or said second object and/or said third object are furthermore able to contain cryptographic material (paragraph [0123], lines 8-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson as applied to claim 6, in view of Fraser at al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0131232).

14. With respect to claim 9, Hanson discloses the device according to claim 6, but does not disclose that the first device is able to banish another device of said community if the identity of said device to be banished is contained in said first or second object of said first device.

However, Fraser, in an analogous art, discloses that a registration agent of a community may remove a member from the community (Fraser: paragraph 0066).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hanson with the teachings of Fraser. The motivation to combine being to provide a security mechanism for the community by having the capability to remove a member of the community (Fraser: paragraph 0067).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed February 22, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. With respect to claims 1 and 9, the applicant argues that Hanson fails to disclose *means adapted to store information about devices of the community having trust relationships with said device.*

17. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant's argument that Hanson merely maintains session information, by way of the MES, discounts the earlier establishment of the session, maintained by the MES, as a session based on a trust relationship. The trust relationship of the session is implemented by Hanson by certifying and encrypting all information transmitted to/from the MES (paragraph [0123], lines 8-10). Hanson goes on to elaborate on various different security embodiments that teach the coordination of networked computers maintaining trust relationships (beginning at paragraph [0392]).

18. Furthermore with respect to claims 1 and 9, the applicant argues that Hanson fails to disclose *means adapted to store information about devices of the community having had trust relationships with said device in the past but now not trusted by said device*.

19. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As argued above, the examiner maintains that Hanson clearly teaches the functionality of trust relationships. With regards to the applicant's interpretation of the cited section of the prior pertaining to the expiration of trust relationships, paragraph [0218] discloses an embodiment whereby a trusted client may have their relationship terminated, based on the period of time in which they were engaged in a session with the MES (among other possible reasons for their expiration), and as such would become a client who has since had a trust relationship but at the present no longer does. Such information about clients who's sessions have expired are indeed stored by the Mobile Management Server **102**.

20. Furthermore with respect to claims 1 and 9, the applicant argues that Hanson fails to disclose *means for trust relationships synchronization with each device belonging to said community of network devices based on the stored information.*

21. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Again, the applicant is relying on the cited passages, without considering the entirety of the prior art. Based on the above arguments, and in light of the citation of paragraph [0099], the examiner maintains that the synchronization of the trust relationships is disclosed by Hanson to be stored by the Mobile End System, whereby such information maybe retrieved to ensure the security of the network as a while by only allowing clients who's security credentials are know to access the system.

Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLAKE RUBIN whose telephone number is (571) 270-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4/5/11

/Rubin Blake/
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457